

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/085,728

Applicant(s)

KANEKO, MITSURU

Examiner

Brenda A Lamb

Art Unit

1734

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Brenda A Lamb.

(3) _____

(2) Attorney LaPointe.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 2 September 2004

and 7 September 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:



Telephonic



Video Conference



Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

None

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: : Examiner Lamb called Attorney LaPointe to indicate that the newly submitted drawing filed 8/3/04 were objected to as failing to provide a reference number for the plurality of pinch rollers for straightening out the blade material plated from the take-up reel and this drawing/replacement sheet filed 8/03/04 would not be entered. Attorney LaPointe submitted a new replacement sheet of Figure 1 on 9/3/2004 and this drawing is acceptable by the examiner. (see the attached initialed approval of the replacement drawing by the examiner).